14th March 1955]

when he was here in connexion with the Congress Session at Avadi. He requested me that I should write to him as soon as he reached Delhi. I wrote to him a personal letter enclosing the correspondence between this Government and the Government of India previously. He has written to me back saying that the matter is engaging his attention and he is hoping that he will be able to introduce a Bill with reference to cross-word puzzles during this session itself. I am hoping that such a legislation would be introduced in the Parliament and would be passed expeditiously."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Regarding question No. 1314—Relating to Secondary Education Commission—and the doubt expressed by the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have seen the original record and I find therein the word ' retrenchment ' only."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" I have never said, Sir, that the mistake crept in the office."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Questions over."

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—POINT OF ORDER *RE* LANGUAGE TO BE USED BY MEMBERS IN THE HOUSE.

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" The point of order that I wish to raise relates to the doubt in the minds of some of the hon. Members of this House and to the comments in some newspapers as to what should be the language which ought to be used in the Assembly. Sir, I have to invite your attention to Article 210 of the Constitution of India which says :

' Notwithstanding anything in Part XVII, but subject to the provisions of Article 348, business in the Legislature of a State shall be transacted in the official language or languages of the State or in Hindi or in English :

Provided that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly or Chairman of the Legislative Council, or person acting as such, as the case may be, may permit any Member who cannot adequately express himself in any of the languages aforesaid to address the House in his mother-tongue.'

Therefore, the Speaker, as per this Article, can allow any Member to speak in a language which is not the official language only in case he cannot adequately express himself in the official language.

" Article 345 says—

' Subject to the provisions of Articles 346 and 347, the Legislature of a State may by law adopt any one or more of the languages in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of that State.'

This provision means that unless the State has by law adopted any language to be used in the State as the official language, the language used shall be either Hindi or English. Therefore, if any one wants to change the official language of the State, it must be done by means of legislation. In the previous Assembly Rules,

you would find, Sir, that the Article of the Constitution which I read is more or less repeated with reference to the language to be used here and it states :

'... that unless the Speaker of the Assembly is satisfied that a Member could not express himself properly in the official language of the State, he should not be allowed to speak in his own mother-tongue.'

Now, I find in the present Assembly Rules that changes have been made regarding the language to be used for the business of the proceedings which are in contravention of the provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, Sir, the Speaker should not allow ordinarily a Member who is able to express himself in English . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" How am I to know that unless probably I hold an examination . . ."

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" You, Sir, will be able to know from your experience who is able to express himself well in English and who is not. You, as Mayor of Madras, were insisting that persons . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I was Mayor of Madras in 1937. Since then, the Constitution has changed. We had introduced such a rule before the new Constitution came into force . . . ."

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" My object is not to deter the proceedings of the Assembly. My object is to bring it to the notice of the House and the Hon. Speaker that there has been some complaint from some Members that they are not able to follow the proceedings of the House. In fact, the Hon. Speaker himself will realise . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I sympathise with the hon. Members . . ."

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" One-sixth of the House consists of Members who do not know the language which is ordinarily used here. I would like to draw your attention to the relevant Articles which I have placed before you so that it may be necessary that ordinarily the official language, that is English, must be used here. But if it is the desire of the House that the official language must be changed, it is open to the House to do so by means of a legislation to bring in any language as the language of the State. But without making that legislation, it is not proper to use any other language. One hon. Member, I found, spoke in Kannada language. We must have some sort of proper procedure in this matter. After all, we must have an objective in our mind. The objective is to have an unified India. You will find in the Constitution that in the years to come, the language which we use between one State and another State, must be the language of the unified India. That common language may be Hindi. Whatever rules we may frame or procedure we may adopt must conform to that objective, namely, that of one language in a unified India."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I do really sympathise with the point of view put forward by the hon. Member. But,

14th March 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

at the same time, he should realise that not merely one-sixth of the Members of the House but nearly half the number of Members of this House are unable to follow the proceedings in English. Therefore, we have to take a practical view and see that business is carried on in such a way that most of the Members are able to follow the proceedings. What are we doing here after all? When a question is put in Tamil, we reply in Tamil, as far as questions are concerned. After all what does the Article of the Constitution lay down? It states that any Member who cannot adequately express himself in any of the languages of the State can speak in his mother-tongue—and express himself for what purpose—so that he may make himself understood. When I am answering a Member who does not know English and who puts his question in Tamil, it should be possible for me to express myself in such a way that I may make the Member understand. That is the purpose of expression. The purpose of my expression is not my self-satisfaction that I am able to express myself in fluent or chaste English but to make the other person understand. Therefore, when a question is put by a person who does not know English, I can make him understand only by expressing it in the mother-tongue. By doing so, I am not going beyond the limits of the Article in the Constitution.

"As far as the other point put forward is concerned, I have already stated that with reference to subjects in which all the Members are interested, the Ministers will generally answer in English, but in respect of subjects in which only a particular section is interested and if that section happens to be the Tamil section, then the Ministers may express themselves in Tamil language.

"With reference to any subject, if the Minister feels that he 9-40
will be able to express himself better in his mother-tongue, then the Minister will speak in Tamil. In these circumstances, we are not transgressing the provisions of the Constitution; on the other hand, we are only carrying out the provisions of the Constitution and I am sure the hon. Member will agree with me that we are trying to make the best of the situation here in a multi-lingual State. We are trying to carry on our business as best as possible. After all the rules are intended only for that purpose and not for the purpose of ignoring facts and creating difficulties to the hon. Members."

III.—EXPRESSION OF THANKS *RE* ESCAPE OF THE HON. PRIME MINISTER IN THE NAGPUR INCIDENT.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, before we pass on to the business of the House, I request, with your permission, to refer to the deplorable incident which happened at Nagpur day before yesterday (11th March 1955). We were all shocked when we learnt that a person made an attempt at the life of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister himself has given a version of the incident and he has requested the nation as a whole to treat it as the act of a cranky person. It is our wish that it is so and